



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| 09/815,760 | 03/23/2001 | Alan Derck Dean | 78104123/N10817 | 7939 |
| 25005 7590 12/31/2007 DEWITT ROSS & STEVENS S.C. 8000 EXCELSIOR DR SUITE 401 MADISON, WI 53717-1914 | | | EXAMINER PATEL, HARESH N | |
| | | | ART UNIT 2154 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | MAIL DATE 12/31/2007 | DELIVERY MODE PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/815,760 | Applicant(s) DEAN, ALAN DEREK | |
| | Examiner Haresh Patel | Art Unit 2154 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-7,10-12,14-16,18-20 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-7, 10-12, 14-16, 18-20, 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 4-7, 10-12, 14-16, 18-20 and 23 are subject to examination. Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 13, 17, 21, 22 are cancelled.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to amended claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

3. As per the remarks dated 8/3/07, the title as per the claimed invention is suggested as :
“Standardized E-mail construction and search based on geographic location”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 4-7, 10-12, 14-16, 18-20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor, 2006/0184504, hereinafter Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway, in view of “Official Notice”.
6. Referring to claim 1, Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway discloses a program storage device readable by a machine and encoding a program of instructions for generating and

providing access to electronic mail addresses for individuals in a geographic region (e.g., page 1), the program of instructions comprising: instructions collecting name and known location data of an individual from an information source (e.g., page 1); instructions creating an at least partial entry for the individual in an index of individuals in a database, the at least partial entry being collected created once the name data and the known location data of the individual are collected (e.g., page 2); instructions triggering generation of an electronic mail address for the individual once both the name data and the known location data have been collected wherein: the name data includes at least a family name of the individual, and the location data includes one or more of a country specific postal address locator code a region specific portion of a telephone number (e.g., page 2); the instructions including: instructions generating name code indicative of the collected name data of the individual (e.g., page 2); instructions generating a location code indicative of the collected known location data of the individual (e.g., page 2); and instructions generating the electronic mail address for the individual based on the personal name code and the location code (e.g., page 2); instructions to submitting the electronic mail address for the individual to the database; and instructions searching the database using the personal name code and the location code for the individual to locate the electronic mail address of the individual (e.g., page 2).

Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway does not specifically mention about standardized email addresses. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing standardized email addresses is well known and expected in the art. For example, Agraharam et al., AT&T, 5,987,508, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 5. Pena, 6,292,211, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 13, lines 39 – 67. Grauman, 6,707,472, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 9, lines 36-45, figure 3. Hall 5,930,479,

discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 5, lines 1 – 48. Ramey et al., 6,298,128 discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 2, lines 28 – 65). Toyoda, 6,897,985, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 5, lines 2-38, col., 6, lines 2 - 26. Oseto 6,9097,797 discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 3, lines 2 – 48. Scroggie et al., 5,970,469, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 9, lines 29 –41. Pennell et al., 2005/0125546, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, paragraphs 11 and 12. Dovolis, 2001/0034609, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, paragraph 39, abstract; Pennell et al., 6,874,023, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, paragraph 24; Szutu, 2001/0047391, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, paragraphs 11 and 12. Rudy et al., 6,360,252, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 19, line 5 – 22, line 54 – col., 20, line 23. Yahoo People search, 02/08/1999, <http://people.yahoo.com>, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, pages 1 and 2. Lytle et al., 2003/0120737, Microsoft Corporation, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, paragraph 130. Kasso et al., 6,173,283, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 2, lines 1 – 35. Brezin et al., 7,039,639, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 4, lines 7 – 38. Brown, Nortel Networks Corporation, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, figures 1, 2, col., 4, lines 13 - 26. Kleinberg, 2001/0037265, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, figure 1, col., 3, lines 23 - 46. Siitonen et al., 6,049,796, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, abstract. Beck et al., 6,026,371, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, figure 3B, col., 4, lines 23 – 48.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include standardized email address with the teachings of Taylor-Yellow-Pages-

Superhighway in order to facilitate usage of the standardized email addresses because the email address would provide information regarding the owner of the email address. The standardized email address would enhance differentiating email addresses with the owner specific information.

7. Referring to claim 4, Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway also discloses wherein one or more email addresses are automatically created for each individual in a country, geographic, region or state without each individual providing name and known location data to the program storage device (e.g., page 3).

8. Referring to claim 5, Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway also discloses wherein one or more subsidiary addresses, including existing electronic addresses, are associated with the electronic mail address of the individual in the database (e.g., page 3).

9. Referring to claim 6, Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway also discloses wherein the instructions are further operable to attach a unique numeric identifier to the electronic mail address of the individual (e.g., page 4).

10. Referring to claim 7, Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above (please refer to claim 1 for the official notice). Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway also discloses a system for generating and providing access to electronic mail addresses for individuals in a geographical region, the system comprising: one or more computers configured to: collect name and known location data of an individual from an information source (e.g., page 1); create an at least partial entry for the individual in an index of individuals in a database, the at least partial entry being created once the name data and the known location data of the individual are collected (e.g., page 1); generate an electronic mail address for the individual once both the name and the known location data have been collected wherein: the name data includes at least the a family name of the individual, and the known location data includes one or more of a country specific postal address locator code, a region specific portion of a telephone number (e.g., page 2); the electronic mail address including: a personal name code indicative of the name data of the individual (e.g., page 2); the personal name code including the family name of the individual; a location code indicative of the known location data of the individual; and wherein the electronic mail address for the individual is based on the personal name code and the location code (e.g., page 2); submit the electronic mail address for the individual to the database, and a computer including a search engine for searching the database using the personal name code and the location code to locate the electronic mail address associated with the individual (e.g., page 3).

11. Referring to claim 10, Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway also discloses wherein the

generation of the electronic mail address includes the automatic creation of one or more email addresses for each individual in a country, geographic region or state associated with the individual, without the individual providing name and known location data to the system (e.g., page 3).

12. Referring to claim 11, Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway also discloses wherein the one or more computers are also configured to associate one or more subsidiary addresses, including existing electronic addresses, with the electronic mail address of the individual in the database (e.g., page 3).

13. Referring to claim 12, Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway also discloses wherein the one or more computers are also configured to attach a unique numeric identifier to the electronic mail address of the individual (e.g., page 4).

14. Referring to claim 14, Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway also discloses wherein the instructions are further operable to provide the database of electronic mail addresses on-line (e.g., page 5).

15. Referring to claim 15, Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway also discloses wherein the instructions are further operable to locate the electronic mail address of the individual in the database (e.g., page 6).

16. Referring to claim 16, Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway also discloses wherein the instructions are further operable to: determine whether the electronic mail address generated for the individual based on the personal name code and the location code is non-unique (e.g., page 7), and wherein upon determining that the electronic mail address generated is non-unique, generating the electronic mail address for the individual by attaching a unique numeric indicator to the electronic mail address (e.g., page 7).

17. Referring to claim 18, Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway also discloses wherein the one or more computers provide the database of electronic mail addresses on-line (e.g., page 3).

18. Referring to claim 19, Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway also discloses wherein the one or more computers locate the electronic mail address of the individual in the database (e.g., page 4).

19. Referring to claim 20, Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway also discloses wherein the one or more computers also: a. determine whether the electronic mail address generated for the individual based on the personal name code and the location code is non-unique (e.g., page 7), and upon determining that the electronic mail address generated is non-unique, generate the electronic mail address for the individual by attaching an unique numeric indicator to the electronic mail address (e.g., page 7).

20. Referring to claim 23, Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above (please refer to claim 1 for the official notice). Taylor-Yellow-Pages-Superhighway also discloses a system method for generating and providing access to electronic mail addresses for individuals in a geographical region (e.g., page 1), the method comprising one or more computers: collecting name data and location data of an individual from one or more preexisting databases (e.g., page 1); creating an at least partial entry for the individual in an index of individuals in an index database, the at least partial entry being created once any name data and location data of the individual are collected from the one or more preexisting databases (e.g., page 1); generating an electronic mail address for the individual after the at least partial entry for the individual has been created in the index, wherein: the electronic mail address is generated once: the collected name data includes at least the family name of the individual, and the collected location data includes one or more of a country specific postal address locator code (e.g., page 2); a region specific portion of a telephone number; the electronic mail address includes: (a) a personal name field, the personal name portion including

at least the family name for the individual (e.g., page 2); a location field, the location portion including at least a portion of the collected location data for the individual (e.g., page 2); storing the electronic mail address in file index database in association with the corresponding name data and location data for the individual; accepting search queries from users, the search queries including one or more of (1) name data, and (2) location data (e.g., page 3), and returning search results to the users, the search results including one or more electronic mail addresses corresponding to one or more of the name data and location data accepted in the user search queries (e.g., page 3).

21. Claims 1, 4-7, 10-12, 14-16, 18-20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcus, 6,230,188, hereinafter Marcus-InfoSpace-Inc, in view of "Official Notice".

22. Referring to claim 1, Marcus-Infosys-Inc discloses a program storage device readable by a machine and encoding a program of instructions for generating and providing access to electronic mail addresses for individuals in a geographic region (e.g., col., 2), the program of instructions comprising: instructions collecting name and known location data of an individual from an information source (e.g., col., 2); instructions creating an at least partial entry for the individual in an index of individuals in a database, the at least partial entry being collected created once the name data and the known location data of the individual are collected (e.g., col., 2); instructions triggering generation of an electronic mail address for the individual once both the name data and the known location data have been collected wherein: the name data includes at least a family name of the individual, and the location data includes one or more of a country

specific postal address locator code a region specific portion of a telephone number (e.g., col., 2); the instructions including: instructions generating name code indicative of the collected name data of the individual (e.g., col., 2); instructions generating a location code indicative of the collected known location data of the individual (e.g., col., 2); and instructions generating the electronic mail address for the individual based on the personal name code and the location code (e.g., col., 2); instructions to submitting the electronic mail address for the individual to the database; and instructions searching the database using the personal name code and the location code for the individual to locate the electronic mail address of the individual (e.g., col., 2).

Marcus-Infosys-Inc does not specifically mention about standardized email addresses. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing standardized email addresses is well known and expected in the art. For example, Agraharam et al., AT&T, 5,987,508, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 5. Pena, 6,292,211, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 13, lines 39 – 67. Grauman, 6,707,472, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 9, lines 36-45, figure 3. Hall 5,930,479, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 5, lines 1 – 48. Ramey et al., 6,298,128 discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 2, lines 28 – 65). Toyoda, 6,897,985, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 5, lines 2-38, col., 6, lines 2 - 26. Oseto 6,9097,797 discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 3, lines 2 – 48. Scroggie et al., 5,970,469, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 9, lines 29 –41. Pennell et al., 2005/0125546, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, paragraphs 11 and 12. Dovolis, 2001/0034609, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, paragraph 39, abstract; Pennell et al., 6,874,023, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, paragraph 24; Szutu,

2001/0047391, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, paragraphs 11 and 12. Rudy et al., 6,360,252, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 19, line 5 – 22, line 54 – col., 20, line 23. Yahoo People search, 02/08/1999, <http://people.yahoo.com>, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, pages 1 and 2. Lytle et al., 2003/0120737, Microsoft Corporation, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, paragraph 130. Kasso et al., 6,173,283, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 2, lines 1 – 35. Brezin et al., 7,039,639, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 4, lines 7 – 38. Brown, Nortel Networks Corporation, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, figures 1, 2, col., 4, lines 13 - 26. Kleinberg, 2001/0037265, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, figure 1, col., 3, lines 23 - 46. Siitonen et al., 6,049,796, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, abstract. Beck et al., 6,026,371, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, figure 3B, col., 4, lines 23 – 48.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include standardized email address with the teachings of Marcus-Infosys-Inc in order to facilitate usage of the standardized email addresses because the email address would provide information regarding the owner of the email address. The standardized email address would enhance differentiating email addresses with the owner specific information.

23. Referring to claim 4, Marcus-Infosys-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Marcus-Infosys-Inc also discloses wherein one or more email addresses are automatically created for each individual in a country, geographic, region or state without each individual providing name and known location data to the program storage device (e.g., col., 3).

24. Referring to claim 5, Marcus-Infosys-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Marcus-Infosys-Inc also discloses wherein one or more subsidiary addresses, including existing electronic addresses, are associated with the electronic mail address of the individual in the database (e.g., col., 3).

25. Referring to claim 6, Marcus-Infosys-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Marcus-Infosys-Inc also discloses wherein the instructions are further operable to attach a unique numeric identifier to the electronic mail address of the individual (e.g., col., 4).

26. Referring to claim 7, Marcus-Infosys-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above (please refer to claim 1 for the official notice). Marcus-Infosys-Inc also discloses a system for generating and providing access to electronic mail addresses for individuals in a geographical region, the system comprising: one or more computers configured to: collect name and known location data of an individual from an information source (e.g., col., 2); create an at least partial entry for the individual in an index of individuals in a database, the at least partial entry being created once the name data and the known location data of the individual are collected (e.g., col., 2); generate an electronic mail address for the individual once both the name and the known location data have been collected wherein: the name data includes at least the a family name of the individual, and the known location data includes one or more of a country specific postal address locator code, a region specific portion of a telephone number (e.g., col., 2); the electronic mail address including: a personal name code indicative of the name data of the individual (e.g.,

col., 2); the personal name code including the family name of the individual; a location code indicative of the known location data of the individual; and wherein the electronic mail address for the individual is based on the personal name code and the location code (e.g., col., 2); submit the electronic mail address for the individual to the database, and a computer including a search engine for searching the database using the personal name code and the location code to locate the electronic mail address associated with the individual (e.g., col., 3).

27. Referring to claim 10, Marcus-Infosys-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Marcus-Infosys-Inc also discloses wherein the generation of the electronic mail address includes the automatic creation of one or more email addresses for each individual in a country, geographic region or state associated with the individual, without the individual providing name and known location data to the system (e.g., col., 3).

28. Referring to claim 11, Marcus-Infosys-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Marcus-Infosys-Inc also discloses wherein the one or more computers are also configured to associate one or more subsidiary addresses, including existing electronic addresses, with the electronic mail address of the individual in the database (e.g., col., 3).

29. Referring to claim 12, Marcus-Infosys-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Marcus-Infosys-Inc also discloses wherein the one or more computers are also configured to attach a unique numeric identifier to the electronic mail address of the individual (e.g., col., 4).

30. Referring to claim 14, Marcus-Infosys-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Marcus-Infosys-Inc also discloses wherein the instructions are further operable to provide the database of electronic mail addresses on-line (e.g., col., 4).

31. Referring to claim 15, Marcus-Infosys-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Marcus-Infosys-Inc also discloses wherein the instructions are further operable to locate the electronic mail address of the individual in the database (e.g., col., 5).

32. Referring to claim 16, Marcus-Infosys-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Marcus-Infosys-Inc also discloses wherein the instructions are further operable to: determine whether the electronic mail address generated for the individual based on the personal name code and the location code is non-unique (e.g., col., 5), and wherein upon determining that the electronic mail address generated is non-unique, generating the electronic mail address for the individual by attaching a unique numeric indicator to the electronic mail address (e.g., col., 5).

33. Referring to claim 18, Marcus-Infosys-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Marcus-Infosys-Inc also discloses wherein the one or more computers provide the database of electronic mail addresses on-line (e.g., col., 3).

34. Referring to claim 19, Marcus-Infosys-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Marcus-Infosys-Inc also discloses wherein the one or more computers locate the electronic mail address of the individual in the database (e.g., col., 4).

35. Referring to claim 20, Marcus-Infosys-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Marcus-Infosys-Inc also discloses wherein the one or more computers also: a. determine whether the electronic mail address generated for the individual based on the personal name code and the location code is non-unique (e.g., col., 5), and upon determining that the electronic mail address generated is non-unique, generate the electronic mail address for the individual by attaching an unique numeric indicator to the electronic mail address (e.g., col., 5).

36. Referring to claim 23, Marcus-Infosys-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above (please refer to claim 1 for the official notice). Marcus-Infosys-Inc also discloses a system method for generating and providing access to electronic mail addresses for individuals in a geographical region (e.g., col., 2), the method comprising one or more computers: collecting name data and location data of an individual from one or more preexisting databases (e.g., col., 2); creating an at least partial entry for the individual in an index of individuals in an index database, the at least partial entry being created once any name data and location data of the individual are collected from the one or more preexisting databases (e.g., col., 2); generating an electronic mail address for the individual after the at least partial entry for the individual has been created in the index, wherein: the electronic mail address is generated once: the collected name data includes at least the family name of the individual, and the collected location data

includes one or more of a country specific postal address locator code (e.g., col., 2); a region specific portion of a telephone number; the electronic mail address includes: (a) a personal name field, the personal name portion including at least the family name for the individual (e.g., col., 2); a location field, the location portion including at least a portion of the collected location data for the individual (e.g., col., 2); storing the electronic mail address in file index database in association with the corresponding name data and location data for the individual; accepting search queries from users, the search queries including one or more of (1) name data, and (2) location data (e.g., col., 3), and returning search results to the users, the search results including one or more electronic mail addresses corresponding to one or more of the name data and location data accepted in the user search queries (e.g., col., 3).

37. Claims 1, 4-7, 10-12, 14-16, 18-20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al, 6,108,691, hereinafter Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc, in view of "Official Notice".

38. Referring to claim 1, Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc discloses a program storage device readable by a machine and encoding a program of instructions for generating and providing access to electronic mail addresses for individuals in a geographic region (e.g., col., 2), the program of instructions comprising: instructions collecting name and known location data of an individual from an information source (e.g., col., 2); instructions creating an at least partial entry for the individual in an index of individuals in a database, the at least partial entry being collected created once the name data and the known location data of the individual are collected (e.g., col., 2); instructions triggering generation of an electronic mail address for the individual once both

the name data and the known location data have been collected wherein: the name data includes at least a family name of the individual, and the location data includes one or more of a country specific postal address locator code a region specific portion of a telephone number (e.g., col., 2); the instructions including: instructions generating name code indicative of the collected name data of the individual (e.g., col., 2); instructions generating a location code indicative of the collected known location data of the individual (e.g., col., 2); and instructions generating the electronic mail address for the individual based on the personal name code and the location code (e.g., col., 2); instructions to submitting the electronic mail address for the individual to the database; and instructions searching the database using the personal name code and the location code for the individual to locate the electronic mail address of the individual (e.g., col., 2).

Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc does not specifically mention about standardized email addresses. “Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing standardized email addresses is well known and expected in the art. For example, Agraharam et al., AT&T, 5,987,508, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 5. Pena, 6,292,211, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 23, lines 39 – 67. Grauman, 6,707,472, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 9, lines 36-45, figure 3. Hall 5,930,479, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 5, lines 1 – 48. Ramey et al., 6,298,128 discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 2, lines 28 – 65). Toyoda, 6,897,985, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 5, lines 2-38, col., 6, lines 2 - 26. Oseto 6,909,797 discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 3, lines 2 – 48. Scroggie et al., 5,970,469, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 9, lines 29 –41. Pennell et al., 2005/0125546, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, paragraphs 11 and 12. Dovolis,

2001/0034609, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, paragraph 39, abstract; Pennell et al., 6,874,023, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, paragraph 24; Szutu, 2001/0047391, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, paragraphs 11 and 12. Rudy et al., 6,360,252, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 29, line 5 – 22, line 54 – col., 20, line 23. Yahoo People search, 02/08/1999, <http://people.yahoo.com>, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, pages 1 and 2. Lytle et al., 2003/0120737, Microsoft Corporation, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, paragraph 130. Kasso et al., 6,173,283, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 2, lines 1 – 35. Brezin et al., 7,039,639, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, col., 4, lines 7 – 38. Brown, Nortel Networks Corporation, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, figures 1, 2, col., 4, lines 13 - 26. Kleinberg, 2001/0037265, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, figure 1, col., 3, lines 23 - 46. Siitonen et al., 6,049,796, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, abstract. Beck et al., 6,026,371, discloses these well-known claimed limitations, figure 3B, col., 4, lines 23 – 48.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include standardized email address with the teachings of Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc in order to facilitate usage of the standardized email addresses because the email address would provide information regarding the owner of the email address. The standardized email address would enhance differentiating email addresses with the owner specific information.

39. Referring to claim 4, Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc also discloses wherein one or more email addresses are

automatically created for each individual in a country, geographic, region or state without each individual providing name and known location data to the program storage device (e.g., col., 3).

40. Referring to claim 5, Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc also discloses wherein one or more subsidiary addresses, including existing electronic addresses, are associated with the electronic mail address of the individual in the database (e.g., col., 3).

41. Referring to claim 6, Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc also discloses wherein the instructions are further operable to attach a unique numeric identifier to the electronic mail address of the individual (e.g., col., 4).

42. Referring to claim 7, Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above (please refer to claim 1 for the official notice). Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc also discloses a system for generating and providing access to electronic mail addresses for individuals in a geographical region, the system comprising: one or more computers configured to: collect name and known location data of an individual from an information source (e.g., col., 2); create an at least partial entry for the individual in an index of individuals in a database, the at least partial entry being created once the name data and the known location data of the individual are collected (e.g., col., 2); generate an electronic mail address for the individual once both the name and the known location data have been collected wherein: the name data includes at least the a family name of the individual, and the known location data includes one or more of a

country specific postal address locator code, a region specific portion of a telephone number (e.g., col., 2); the electronic mail address including: a personal name code indicative of the name data of the individual (e.g., col., 2); the personal name code including the family name of the individual; a location code indicative of the known location data of the individual; and wherein the electronic mail address for the individual is based on the personal name code and the location code (e.g., col., 2); submit the electronic mail address for the individual to the database, and a computer including a search engine for searching the database using the personal name code and the location code to locate the electronic mail address associated with the individual (e.g., col., 3).

43. Referring to claim 10, Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc also discloses wherein the generation of the electronic mail address includes the automatic creation of one or more email addresses for each individual in a country, geographic region or state associated with the individual, without the individual providing name and known location data to the system (e.g., col., 3).

44. Referring to claim 11, Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc also discloses wherein the one or more computers are also configured to associate one or more subsidiary addresses, including existing electronic addresses, with the electronic mail address of the individual in the database (e.g., col., 3).

45. Referring to claim 12, Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc also discloses wherein the one or more computers are also configured to attach a unique numeric identifier to the electronic mail address of the individual (e.g., col., 4).

46. Referring to claim 14, Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc also discloses wherein the instructions are further operable to provide the database of electronic mail addresses on-line (e.g., col., 4).

47. Referring to claim 15, Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc also discloses wherein the instructions are further operable to locate the electronic mail address of the individual in the database (e.g., col., 5).

48. Referring to claim 16, Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc also discloses wherein the instructions are further operable to: determine whether the electronic mail address generated for the individual based on the personal name code and the location code is non-unique (e.g., col., 5), and wherein upon determining that the electronic mail address generated is non-unique, generating the electronic mail address for the individual by attaching a unique numeric indicator to the electronic mail address (e.g., col., 5).

49. Referring to claim 18, Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc also discloses wherein the one or more computers provide the database of electronic mail addresses on-line (e.g., col., 3).

50. Referring to claim 19, Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc also discloses wherein the one or more computers locate the electronic mail address of the individual in the database (e.g., col., 4).

51. Referring to claim 20, Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc also discloses wherein the one or more computers also: a. determine whether the electronic mail address generated for the individual based on the personal name code and the location code is non-unique (e.g., col., 5), and upon determining that the electronic mail address generated is non-unique, generate the electronic mail address for the individual by attaching an unique numeric indicator to the electronic mail address (e.g., col., 5).

52. Referring to claim 23, Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above (please refer to claim 1 for the official notice). Lee-SwitchBoard-Inc also discloses a system method for generating and providing access to electronic mail addresses for individuals in a geographical region (e.g., col., 2), the method comprising one or more computers: collecting name data and location data of an individual from one or more preexisting databases (e.g., col., 2); creating an at least partial entry for the individual in an index of individuals in an index database, the at least partial entry being created once any name data and location data of the

individual are collected from the one or more preexisting databases (e.g., col., 2); generating an electronic mail address for the individual after the at least partial entry for the individual has been created in the index, wherein: the electronic mail address is generated once: the collected name data includes at least the family name of the individual, and the collected location data includes one or more of a country specific postal address locator code (e.g., col., 2); a region specific portion of a telephone number; the electronic mail address includes: (a) a personal name field, the personal name portion including at least the family name for the individual (e.g., col., 2); a location field, the location portion including at least a portion of the collected location data for the individual (e.g., col., 2); storing the electronic mail address in file index database in association with the corresponding name data and location data for the individual; accepting search queries from users, the search queries including one or more of (1) name data, and (2) location data (e.g., col., 3), and returning search results to the users, the search results including one or more electronic mail addresses corresponding to one or more of the name data and location data accepted in the user search queries (e.g., col., 3).

Conclusion

In order to expedite the prosecution of this case, multiple references are used for the rejections to demonstrate that several references disclose the claimed subject matter of the claims.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the

convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number:
09/815,760
Art Unit: 2154

Page 26



HARESH PATEL

PRIMARY EXAMINER

12/22/07